

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Toru Abiko, et al.

Serial No.: 10/509,308

Group Art Unit: 1745

Filed: September 27, 2006

Examiner Henok G. Heyi

Customer No.: 26263

For: OPTICAL RECORDING MEDIUM AND METHOD FOR MANUFACTURING
THE SAME

Via EFS WEB ELECTRONIC FILING

INTERVIEW SUMMARY
FILED PURSUANT TO MPEP 713.04

Sir:

This Paper is filed to memorialize the Interviews conducted on January 9, 2009, February 12, 2009, and February 26, 2009 between Examiner Henok G. Heyi ("Examiner") and one of the Attorneys of Record, Adam Rehm ("Applicant") .

Please enter the following with respect to the above-identified Application.

A. Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted:

N/A.

B. Claims discussed:

N/A.

C. Prior art discussed:

N/A.

D. Proposed amendments:

N/A.

E. Principal arguments of the Applicant and the Examiner:

N/A.

F. Other pertinent matters discussed:

During the Interview of January 9, 2009, Applicant pointed out the improper Final Office Action dated October 16, 2008 in view of the new grounds for rejection without amendment to the claims.¹ The Examiner reviewed the file history, concurred, and stated that a new Non Final Office Action would be sent to correct the finality of the Final Office Action dated October 16, 2008.

Applicant telephoned the Examiner again on February 12, 2009 to note that the new Non Final Office Action had not been issued and request status. Examiner stated that the SPE had signed the new non-final Office Action at the beginning of the month and that it should be received by Applicant anytime.

Again on February 26, 2009, Applicant telephoned the Examiner to note that the new Non Final Office Action had not been issued and request status. Examiner stated that an LIE had returned the new Non Final Office Action but the Examiner had resubmitted it. The Examiner apologized and advised that he would be informing the SPE of the delays incurred by Applicant in an effort to expedite transmittal of the new Non Final Office Action.

¹ The Amendment filed July 10, 2008 did not change the scope of the claims because it only added a comma and omitted a duplicate "wherein" in one independent claim, and added "the method including the steps of" to a method claim of another independent claim.

Appl. No. 10/509,308
Docket No. 09792909-5980
Response Dated: February 26, 2009

G. Result of the interview:

The Examiner agreed to transmit a new Non Final Office Action to correct the finality of the Final Office Action dated October 16, 2008.

H. Conclusion:

Applicants note with appreciation the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the Interviews.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By /Adam C. Rehm/
Adam C. Rehm, Reg. No. 54,797
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
816-460-2542 (telephone)
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT